(4)

SINGLE BENCH

CF 6001 -

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. NO. (SERVICE) 571 **/2007**

PETITIONERS

1. Vishnu Ram, S/o. Punit Ram, aged about 52 years, R/o. Village Gataopar, Tehsil Kurud, District Dhamtari (C.G.)
2. Santu, S/o. Samaru, aged about 55 years, R/o. Village Togro, Tehsil Abhanpur, District Raipur. (C.G.)
3. Manglu, S/o. Nammu, aged about 57 years, R/o. Village Dandesara Tehsil Kurud, District Dhamtari (C.G.)
4. Halu, S/o. Itwari , aged about 55 years, R/o. Village Dandesara Tehsil Kurud, District Dhamtari (C.G.)
5. Rama, S/o. Ravi Shankar, aged about 52 years, R/o. Village Kondopara, Tehsil Kurud, District Dhamtari (C.G.)
6. Phuleshwari Bai, W/o. Vishnu Ram, aged 50 years, R/o. Village Gataopar, Tehsil Kurud, District Dhamtari (C.G.)

P.R. No. 609/07 Shri Sameer Sahu
Presented on 12/1/07
dated

RECEIPT COPY 8/1/07

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS

1. State of Chhattisgarh,
   Through Secretary,
   Public Works Department,
   Mantralaya, D.K.S. Bhavan, Raipur (C.G.)
2. Engineer in Chief
   Public Works Department,
   Mantralaya D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA FOR ISSUANCE OF A WRIT IN THE NATURE OF MANDAMUS, PROHIBITION, CERTIORARI ETC. OR ANY OTHER DIRECTION OR ORDER TO DO JUSTICE IN THE MATTER

16/01/07

(43)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

SINGLE BENCH : HON'BLE MR. SATISH K. AGNIHOTRI, J.

WRIT PETITION (S.) NO.571 OF 2007

Petitioners : Vishnu Ram and others

versus

Respondents : State of Chhattisgarh and another

Present : Mr. Sunil Otwani, counsel for the petitioners.
Mr. Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the State/ respondents.

ORDER

(Passed on 29th Day of January, 2007)

Learned counsel appearing for the parties jointly submit that the facts and question of law involved in the present writ petition are squarely covered by the decision of this Court in the case of ***Ram Prasad Yadav and others*** **vs.** ***State of Chhattisgarh and others*** (Writ Petition No.454 of 2005), dated 4-1-2007.

2. For the aforementioned reasons, the writ petition is allowed in terms of the decision of this Court in the matter of ***Ram Prasad Yadav and others*** **vs.** ***State of Chhattisgarh and others*** (Supra). No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Gopal